Case 3:09-cr-00859-JAP Document 39 Filed 11/17/10 Page 1 of 3 PageID: 134 Case 3:09-cr-00859-JAP Document 37-1 Filed 11/15/10 Page 1 of 3 PageID: 128

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Hon. Joel A. Pisano, U.S.D.J.

v.

RECEICTIMINAL No. 09-859 (JAP)

MARC VELASQUEZ VERSON, ELLEN THOMPSON & DORIS MARTINEZ NOV 17 GRIBER OF CONTINUANCE

AT 8:30_____M WILLIAM T. WALSH CLERK

This Court having signed an Order of for a Speedy Trial Extension on January 7, 2010, for the reasons stated therein and pursuant to which it was ordered that the period stated therein shall be excludable in computing time under the Speedy Trial Act of 1974 ("the Speedy Trial Act"), 18 U.S.C. § 3161; and

This Court having signed the Second Order for a Speedy Trial Extension on March 17, 2010 for the reasons stated therein and pursuant to which it was ordered that the period stated therein shall be excludable in computing time under the Speedy Trial Act; and

This Court having signed the Third Order for a Speedy Trial Extension on June 2, 2010, for the reasons stated therein and pursuant to which it was ordered that the period stated therein shall be excludable in computing time under the Speedy Trial Act; and

This Court having signed the Fourth Order for a Speedy Trial Extension on August 9, 2010, for the reasons stated therein and pursuant to which it was ordered that the period stated therein shall be excludable in computing time under the Speedy Trial Act; and

This Court having signed the Fifth Order for a Speedy Trial Extension on September 30, 2010, for the reasons stated therein and pursuant to which it was ordered that the period stated therein shall be excludable in computing time under the Speedy Trial Act.

This matter having come before the Court upon the application of defendant, ELLEN THOMPSON, by her attorney, Catherine M. Brown, Esq., and with the consent of the United States, by the Department of Justice (Brigham Cannon, Trial Attorney, appearing), and of the co-defendants, Marc Velasquez Verson and Doris Martinez, (by STEVEN J. ROMAN, ESQ., appearing) for an Order granting a continuance of the proceedings on the Indictment in the above-captioned matter inasmuch as the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial because:

- the failure to grant such a continuance would deny counsel for the Defendant
 the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the
 exercise of due diligence; and
- (ii) the case being so complex due to the nature of the prosecution that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or for the trial itself within the time limits established by the Speedy Trial Act and the schedule set forth in the Court's Order for Discovery and Inspection and the previous Orders of Continuance referred to above, and
- (iii) the Defendant being aware that she has the right to have the matter tried within 70 days of his initial appearance before a Federal court or his indictment, and for good cause shown;

IT IS THE FINDING OF THIS COURT that this action should be continued for the following reasons:

- 1. To allow the parties a meaningful opportunity for plea negotiations; and
- 2. That the case is complex because of, among other things, (a) the logistical complexity

created by the fact that the defendant is deaf and is presently living in California; and (b) the nature and geographical reach of the alleged conspiracy and the complex factual and legal issues present; and

- 3. That the failure to grant a continuance would deny counsel for the Defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective trial preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence; and
- 4. That pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161(h)(8), the ends of justice served by granting a continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the Defendant in a speedy trial.

WHEREFORE, IT IS on this 17 day of November, 2010,

ORDERED that this action be, and it hereby is, continued until February 15, 2011; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that:

The trial date is scheduled for _______, 2011 at ______ a.m.; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the period between November 16, 2010, and February 15, 2011 shall be excludable in computing time under the Speedy Trial Act.

HON. JOHAA. PISANO United States District Judge